

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

Claims 2-13 are pending in this application. Claims 12 and 13 have been amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed, and specifically at page 19. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

The Office Action indicated an objection to the drawings. The drawing in have been corrected and attached at the end of this Amendment as a "Replacement Sheet." In Fig. 1, the luminance and chroma conditioning setting circuit previously labeled 6 is now labeled 7. Applicant has made such changes and therefore respectfully requests that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Claims 2-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement due to the term "extracted." Claims 2-13, as presented herein, are believed to be in compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 7, 8, 9, 12, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,608,464 to Woodman et al.

Independent claim 12, as amended, recites, *inter alia*:

“...a mixing circuit for receiving said key signal, said image signal, and said conversion image signal and for generating a converted image signal there from in accordance with the following relationship: converted image signal = (A-B)•K+B.”

Applicants submit that the portions of U.S. Patent No. 5,608,464 to Woodman cited in the Office Action (hereinafter, merely “Woodman”) do not disclose the above-identified features of claim 12. Therefore, independent claim 12 is believed to be distinguishable from Woodman.

Claims 3, 7-9, and 13 depend from claim 12, and, due to such dependency, are believed to be distinguishable from Woodman for at least the reason previously described.

Claims 2 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,608,464 to Woodman et al. Claims 2 and 4 depend from claim 12, and, due to such dependency, are believed to be distinguishable from Woodman for at least the reason previously described.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Woodman in view of Hickman and Takemura. Claim 5 depends from claim 12, and, due to such dependency, is believed to be distinguishable from Woodman for at least the reason previously described. The Examiner does not appear to have relied upon Hickman or Takemura to overcome the above described deficiencies of Woodman. Accordingly, claim 5 is believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Woodman, Hickman, and Takemura.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Woodman in view of Their et al. Claim 6 depends from claim 12, and, due to such dependency, is believed to be distinguishable from Woodman for at least the reason previously described. The Examiner

does not appear to have relied upon Their to overcome the above described deficiencies of Woodman. Accordingly, claim 6 is believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Woodman and Their.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Woodman in view of MacDonald. Claim 10 depends from claim 12, and, due to such dependency, is believed to be distinguishable from Woodman for at least the reason previously described. The Examiner does not appear to have relied upon MacDonald to overcome the above described deficiencies of Woodman. Accordingly, claim 10 is believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Woodman and MacDonald.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Woodman in view of Nishimura et al. Claim 11 depends from claim 12, and, due to such dependency, is believed to be distinguishable from Woodman for at least the reason previously described. The Examiner does not appear to have relied upon Nishimura to overcome the above described deficiencies of Woodman. Accordingly, claim 11 is believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Woodman and Nishimura.

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference or references providing the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

PATENT
450100-03140

Please charge any fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit
Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Dennis M. Smid
Reg. No. 34,930
(212) 588-0800